

# A conjecture in the problem of rational definite summation

Mark van Hoeij

February 1, 2008

## Abstract

A conjecture is given that, if true, could lead to an algorithm for computing definite sums of rational functions.

## 1 The conjecture

Let  $C$  be a field of characteristic 0, not necessarily algebraically closed. Let  $n, k$  be variables, and consider the ring  $C(n)[k]$  of polynomials in  $k$ , whose coefficients are rational functions in  $n$ .

For all  $a, b, c \in \mathbf{Q}$  with  $a \neq 0$  we define the  $C(n)$ -algebra homomorphism

$$\psi_{a,b,c} : C(n)[k] \rightarrow C(n)[k]$$

as follows:

$$\psi_{a,b,c}(k) = ak + bn + c.$$

If  $B_1, B_2$  are irreducible elements of  $C(n)[k]$ , then we define the following equivalence relation:  $B_1 \sim_p B_2$  if there exist  $a, b, c \in \mathbf{Q}$ , with  $a \neq 0$  such that  $\psi_{a,b,c}(B_1) = sB_2$  for some unit  $s$  (i.e.  $s$  is a nonzero element of  $C(n)$ ).

Let  $F \in C(n, k)$  be a nonzero rational function in  $n$  and  $k$ . The *partial fraction decomposition* of  $F = F(n, k)$  over  $C(n)$  has the following form:

$$F = Q + F_1 + \cdots + F_t$$

where  $Q \in C(n)[k]$ , and each  $F_i$  is a *partial fraction term* which means the following: there exist a positive integer  $d_i$ , non-zero  $A_i, B_i \in C(n)[k]$  with  $\deg_k(A_i) < \deg_k(B_i)$ , with  $B_i$  irreducible, such that

$$F_i = A_i / B_i^{d_i}.$$

We call two partial-fraction-terms  $F_i$  and  $F_j$  *equivalent*  $F_i \sim F_j$  when

$$d_i = d_j \text{ and } B_i \sim_p B_j.$$

Suppose that there are  $u$  distinct equivalence classes among  $F_1, \dots, F_t$ , and number these equivalence classes  $1, \dots, u$ . Let  $G_i$  be the sum of all  $F_j$  in the  $i$ 'th equivalence class. So we can write

$$F = Q + G_1 + \dots + G_u.$$

Now  $\sum_{k=0}^n F(n, k)$  is a function in just one variable  $n$ . This function is only defined for nonnegative integers  $n$  for which the denominator of  $F(n, k)$  does not vanish for any  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ . Now assume that this is the case for  $n \gg 0$ .

The question now is: Under this assumption, how to decide if this function  $\sum_{k=0}^n F$  is a rational function? More precisely: is there a rational function  $R(n) \in C(n)$  that takes the same values as  $\sum_{k=0}^n F$  whenever both are defined?

**Conjecture:** If  $\sum_{k=0}^n F$  is a rational function, then so is  $\sum_{k=0}^n G_i$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, u\}$ .

The conjecture says that the problem of deciding if  $\sum_{k=0}^n F$  is a rational function (and if so, finding that rational function) can be reduced to the same question for the  $\sum_{k=0}^n G_i$ . This reduces the rational summation problem to a set of smaller summation problems  $\sum_{k=0}^n G_i$ , each of which involves only one equivalence class of partial-fraction-terms.

## 2 A few remarks

Let  $B$  be an irreducible element of  $C(n)[k]$ . Define  $\text{Aut}(B)$  as the set of all  $\psi_{a,b,c}$  with  $a, b, c \in \mathbf{Q}$ ,  $a \neq 0$ , such that  $\psi_{a,b,c}(B) = sB$  for some unit  $s$ . It is easy to see that  $\text{Aut}(B)$  is a group under composition, and that the map

$$\pi : \text{Aut}(B) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}^*$$

sending  $\psi_{a,b,c}$  to  $a$  is an injective group homomorphism. From this it follows that  $\text{Aut}(B)$  has either 1, 2, or  $\infty$  many elements. We call  $B$  of *generic type* if  $\text{Aut}(B)$  has 1 element, *symmetric type* if  $\text{Aut}(B)$  has 2 elements, and *rational type* if  $\text{Aut}(B)$  has  $\infty$  many elements. Note that  $B$  is of rational type if and only if  $B \sim_p k$ .

$G_i$  is a sum of equivalent terms  $A_j/B_j^{d_j}$ . We call  $G_i$  of generic, symmetric, resp. rational type if the  $B_j$  appearing in  $G_i$  are of generic, symmetric, resp. rational type. In order to calculate  $\sum_{k=0}^n G_i$  it helps to distinguish these three types. The rational type allows more kinds of cancelations among equivalent terms  $A_j/B_j^{d_j}$  than the symmetric type, which in turn allows more kinds of cancelations than the generic type. We give an example of cancelation for the generic type: Let  $B(n, k)$  be an arbitrary irreducible polynomial. For example,  $B(n, k) = k^3 + kn + 1$ . Consider:

$$\frac{1}{B(n, k)} - \frac{1}{B(n, n-k)} \tag{1}$$

or

$$\frac{1}{B(n, k)} + \frac{1}{B(n, k + n + 1)} - \frac{1}{B(n, 2k)} - \frac{1}{B(n, 2k + 1)}. \quad (2)$$

These are non-zero rational functions, whose  $\sum_{k=0}^n$  is 0. The algorithm in [1] would detect cancelations like the one in equation (1) but not cancelations like the one in (2). This problem was the starting point for this paper.

The rational and symmetric types allow additional kinds of cancelation. Here is an example for the rational type:

$$1/(k + 1) + 2/(k + 2 + n) - 2/(2k + 1)$$

has sum 0 because it can be rewritten as

$$2/(k + 1) + 2/(k + 2 + n) - 2/(2k + 1) - 2/(2k + 2).$$

We can give examples where the sum is a non-zero rational function by modifying the above examples in such a way that all but a constant number of terms cancel. For example, the sum of:

$$1/(k + 3) + 2/(k + 2 + n) - 2/(2k + 1) \quad (3)$$

differs from the sum of  $1/(k + 1) + 2/(k + 2 + n) - 2/(2k + 1)$  (which was 0) by  $D = 1/(n + 3) + 1/(n - 1 + 3) - 1/(0 + 1) - 1/(1 + 1)$ . To develop an algorithm for rational definite summation, one must identify all possible cancelations and write procedures for each of them. Then, for inputs such as (3), the algorithm must determine if this input can be modified into something that has sum 0, and if so, calculate the difference  $D$  like in the example. One could then try to prove that the algorithm completely solves the problem, that it determines for  $F \in C(n, k)$  if  $\sum_{k=0}^n F$  is a rational function or not, and if so, finds that rational function. For a preliminary implementation of this algorithm, see:

<http://www.math.fsu.edu/~hoeij/SumRat/>

It implements several kinds of cancelations. It is not clear (even if one assumes the conjecture) if this algorithm is complete or not.

**A second question:** Suppose that the denominator of  $F$  has no irreducible factors  $B \in C[n, k]$  for which there exists  $P \in C[k]$  with  $B \sim_p P$ . Suppose furthermore that  $R(n) := \sum_{k=0}^n F(n, k)$  satisfies a linear recurrence relation  $\sum_{i=0}^m a_i(n)R(n + i) = 0$  for some polynomials  $a_i(n) \in C[n]$ , not all zero. Does it then follow that  $R(n)$  is a rational function?

### 3 An example

Let

$$B := k + n(n + 1)/2, \quad F := 1/B, \quad R(n) := \sum_{k=0}^n F \quad \text{where } n > 0.$$

Then  $R(n)$  does not satisfy a linear recurrence with polynomial coefficients.

**Proof:** Suppose that  $m$  is a positive integer and that  $a_0(n), \dots, a_m(n)$  are in  $\mathbf{Z}[n]$  such that  $\sum_{i=0}^m a_i(n)R(n+i)$  is identically 0.

Let  $S_n$  be the set  $\{n(n+1)/2, 1+n(n+1)/2, \dots, n+n(n+1)/2\}$ , so  $R(n) = \sum_{i \in S_n} 1/i$ . Let  $A_n, B_n$  be positive integers, with  $A_n/B_n = R(n)$  and  $\gcd(A_n, B_n) = 1$ . The sets  $S_1, S_2, \dots$  are disjoint and their union is the set of all positive integers. Define  $p_n$  as the product of all prime numbers in  $S_n$ . For  $0 < i < n$ , these primes are larger than  $\max(S_i)$ , so  $\gcd(p_n, B_i) = 1$ .

Assume that  $a_0(n), \dots, a_m(n) \in \mathbf{Z}[n]$ , and that  $a_m(n)$  is not identically zero. Then there exists an integer  $n_1$  such that  $a_m(n) \neq 0$  for all  $n > n_1$ . If  $\sum_{i=0}^m a_i(n)R(n+i) = 0$  then  $a_m(n)$  must be divisible by  $p_{m+n}$  because the factors of  $p_{m+n}$  appear in the denominator of  $R(m+n)$  but not in the denominators of  $R(n), R(n+1), \dots, R(m-1+n)$ . Hence  $p_{m+n} \leq |a_m(n)|$ . Since each prime factor in  $p_{m+n}$  is  $> \frac{1}{2}n^2$  we see that the number of primes in  $S_{m+n}$  is at most  $\ln(|a_m(n)|)/\ln(\frac{1}{2}n^2)$ , which tends to  $\text{degree}(a_m)/2$  for large  $n$ . This means that the density of primes in  $S_n$  is much less than  $1/\ln(\max(S_n))$ , contradicting the prime number theorem (note that  $S_1, S_2, \dots$  are disjoint and their union is the set of all positive integers).

One sees by induction that  $a_{m-1}, \dots, a_0$  must be identically 0 as well. So  $R(n)$  does not satisfy any nonzero linear recurrence relation over  $\mathbf{Z}[n]$ . There can not exist a recurrence relation over  $\mathbf{C}[n]$  either, because if  $K \subset \mathbf{C}$  is the coefficient field of such a recurrence relation, then one can reduce the transcendence degree of the finitely generated field  $K$  by switching to a residue field of a valuation. After finitely many steps, we may assume that the transcendence degree is 0, so  $K$  is a number field. Then one can multiply the recurrence by an element of  $K$  in order to create at least one polynomial  $a_i(n)$  with leading coefficient 1. Then, after taking the trace over the field of rational numbers, one obtains a nonzero recurrence over  $\mathbf{Q}[n]$ , and by multiplying out the denominators one obtains a recurrence over  $\mathbf{Z}[n]$ .

Hopefully primes (or prime ideals) could be used for the conjecture as well.

**Acknowledgments:** I would like to thank Sergei Abramov, Ha Le, Sergei Tsarev and Eugene Zima for discussions on these topics.

## References

- [1] H.Q. Le. *Simplification of Definite Sums of Rational Functions by Creative Symmetrizing Method*. Proceedings ISSAC'2002, ACM Press, p. 161–167, (2002).